| UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT |
|---------------------------------|
| NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA |
| SAN JOSE DIVISION |

RAJA KANNAN,

Plaintiff,

v.

APPLE INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 17-cv-07305-EJD (VKD)

ORDER RE DEFENDANT'S AEO DESIGNATIONS

Re: Dkt. No. 239

The parties ask the Court to resolve their dispute concerning plaintiff Raja Kannan's access to documents and information defendant Apple, Inc. has designated "Highly Confidential – Attorneys' Eyes Only" ("AEO"). Dkt. No. 239. At the Court's direction, the parties conferred further and submitted a status report reflecting their efforts to resolve the dispute. Dkt. No. 249. In addition, at the Court's request, Apple submitted further information regarding how information concerning employee RSU awards and performance bonuses may be expressed. Dkt. No. 259.

Having considered the information the parties provided and the arguments made at the hearing on May 22, 2020 (Dkt. No. 254), the Court orders as follows:

1. Documents containing confidential employee-specific information

Apple shall produce a written summary of the following information for the eight Apple employees who reported to Mr. Kotni during the period of time from January 1, 2011 through December 31, 2018 (Dkt. No. 120 at 2):

- Anonymized employee name
- Job level
- Promotions

| 2 |
|----|
| 3 |
| 4 |
| 5 |
| 6 |
| 7 |
| 8 |
| 9 |
| 10 |
| 11 |
| 12 |
| 13 |
| 14 |
| 15 |
| 16 |
| 17 |
| 18 |
| 19 |
| 20 |
| 21 |
| 22 |
| 23 |
| 24 |
| 25 |
| 26 |
| 27 |
| |

1

| • | Performance | ratings (b | it not self | f-ratings o | or peer | ratings |
|---|-------------|------------|-------------|-------------|---------|---------|
|---|-------------|------------|-------------|-------------|---------|---------|

- Base salary
- Percentage salary increase
- RSU award (indicated as none, low, medium, or high¹)
- Performance bonus (indicated as none, low, medium, or high²)

This information shall be provided for each year during the relevant time period described above. Apple must provide this summary to Mr. Kannan no later than **June 3, 2020**.

2. Redaction/Confidential re-designation

In view of Apple's representations in its papers and during the May 22, 2020 hearing, the Court will not require Apple to redact AEO material and re-produce additional documents with a "Confidential" or no designation, as Mr. Kannan has not stated a specific need for any particular document or information that is not separately addressed by the summary of employee-specific information that Apple will provide in anonymized form.

3. Expert reports

Because the parties' expert reports reflect the proposed testimony of their respective experts, it is critical that Mr. Kannan have as much access to this information as possible, without unduly compromising the privacy of individual employees. The Court directs Apple to review the parties' expert reports, in view of the rulings in this order and the Court's prior orders, to ensure that Apple's redactions are limited to confidential, employee-specific compensation or personnel information. All other information in the expert reports must be made accessible to Mr. Kannan. Apple shall confirm to the Court that it has complied with this order and shall re-produce the expert reports to Mr. Kannan no later than **June 3, 2020**.

///

4

28 || ² See supra n.1.

¹ "Low" represents 1-33% of the maximum amount possible, "medium" represents 34-66% of the maximum amount possible, and "high" represents 67-100% of the maximum amount possible. *See* Dkt. No. 259 at 2.

Case 5:17-cv-07305-EJD Document 262 Filed 05/27/20 Page 3 of 3

Northern District of California United States District Court

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 27, 2020

VIRGINIA K. DEMARCHI United States Magistrate Judge